

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 2 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. section 102. Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify the language. No new matter has been added. Claims 1 and 2 are currently pending in the Application.

Reply to 35 U.S.C. 102 Rejections

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by reference WO 00 27064 by Lucent Technologies, Inc. or Eriksson et al. "Comparison of link quality control strategies for packet data services in EDGE."

Applicants respectfully submit that neither the Lucent reference nor the Eriksson reference anticipate amended claim 1 of the present invention for at least the following reasons.

Lucent teaches a system and method for communicating in a wireless communication system. Figs. 3 and 4 of Lucent show the division of fixed length RLC blocks into coded sub-blocks, in turn, the coded sub-blocks are grouped into transmission units for transmission. The number of sub-blocks in each group is variable so to provide multiple code rates. Eriksson discloses link control strategies for packet data services in EDGE. In particular, Section II of Eriksson discusses a proposed link control technique for EGPRS.

Applicants' invention as recited in amended independent claim 1 performs the step of time-multiplexing the rate-matched code blocks into a coded shared transport channel such that transport format information is reduced by mapping one or more of such information into a single format information. The format information represents signaling information required for transmission over a shared data channel; see specification page 3, lines 25-28. The multiplexing step--as recited in independent claim 1 of the invention--- of the rate matched coded information to be transmitted reduces

signaling information associated with the information to be transmitted over a shared channel by mapping one or more of such signaling information (e.g., Transport Format Combination Indication signaling or TFCI signaling) into a single format information. For example, as is clearly explained in the specification (see page 4, line 27 to page 5, line 12) such signaling information as RI (Rate Information) and Transport Channel Identity Index (TrCH index) can be mapped into M which represents the total number of packet data units to be transmitted. This type of multiplexing is not disclosed, implied or even remotely suggested in either Lucent or Eriksson. Therefore, in view of the above discussion applicants believe that amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by either Lucent or Eriksson and thus claim 1 and dependent claim 2 should now be allowed.

The Examiner has further rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Shiu et al (U.S.P. 6,624,767). In particular, the Examiner asserts that Shiu discloses a method that practices the claimed elements of claims 1 and 2 of the present invention. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Shiu is directed to a receiver unit for use in a CDMA system that comprises a channel processor, a buffer and a data processor. The channel processor processes samples for physical channels for each time interval to provide symbols and the buffer is operated as a number of memory banks. For each time interval, radio frames for physical channels received within that time interval can be stored or permuted to locations of designated sections of the memory bank wherein symbols for a particular traffic can be retrieved from one or more memory banks in permuted order.

In contrast thereto, as explained above, the present invention includes time-multiplexing the rate-matched code blocks into a coded shared transport channel such that transport format information is reduced by mapping one or more of such information into a single format information. Such a technique of mapping transport format information into a single format information is simply not disclosed by the Shiu reference. Accordingly, the Shiu reference does not anticipate the present invention.

Request for Reconsideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.111

Having responded to each and every ground for objection and rejection in the Office Action mailed on August 3, 2004, Applicant requests reconsideration in the instant

application pursuant to 37 CFR 1.111 and requests that the Examiner allow claim(s) 1-2 and pass the application to issue. If there is any point requiring further attention prior to allowance, the Examiner is asked to contact Applicants' counsel who can be reached at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully,

By Claude R. Narcisse
Claude R. Narcisse
Reg. No. 38979
(212) 801-3190

Date: November 1, 2004